

PART A – COVER PAGE

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

SFY 2002 Costa-Machado Water Act of 2000

Chapter 6, Article 2, Watershed Protection Program and Chapter 7, Article 2, Nonpoint Source Control Program

Application Number 159

Project Region X Indicate RWQCB #: 5a

Multi-regional
Project _____ Indicate RWQCB #s: _____

Statewide Project _____

PROJECT TITLE: Bear Creek Watershed Assessment

PROJECT DIRECTOR (one name only) (Ms., Mr., Dr.): Ms. Mary Schroeder June 5, 2002

PRINT _____ DATE _____

LEAD APPLICANT OR ORGANIZATION: Western Shasta Resource Conservation District

TYPE OF AGENCY:

Municipality _____ Local Agency _____ *Nonprofit (non-landowner) _____

Nonprofit (landowner) _____ Local Public Agency X _____

STREET ADDRESS: 3294 Bechelli Lane

CITY: Redding Zip Code: 96002

P.O. BOX: _____ Zip Code: _____

COUNTY Shasta

STATE: California

GPS COORDINATES FOR
PROJECT LOCATION, IF
AVAILABLE:

Center of watershed: N40° 30' 45" W122° 01'
15" or N40.5125 and W122.02083

FISCAL SUMMARY:

Proposition 13 Funds Requested	<u>\$140,806</u>
Other Project Funds	<u>\$ 5,000</u>
Total Project Budget	<u>\$145,806</u>

CERTIFICATION

Please read before signing.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the information I have entered on this application is true and complete to the best of my knowledge and that I am entitled to submit the application on behalf of the applicant (if the applicant is an entity/organization). I further understand that any false, incomplete, or incorrect statements may result in the disqualification of this application. By signing this application, I waive any and all rights to privacy and confidentiality of the proposal on behalf of the applicant, to the extent provided in this RFP.

June 5, 2002

Applicant Signature

Date

Stuart Gray, President, Board of Directors

Printed Name of Applicant

PART B – PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK

1. BACKGROUND AND GOALS

The Bear Creek Watershed is located in the 4.1 North Sacramento Valley Ecological Zone, in Shasta County, Upper Cow-Battle (18020118) watershed area. Bear Creek Watershed is bordered on the north by the Cow Creek Watershed and on the south by the Battle Creek Watershed. This proposal is for a watershed assessment (WA), which is key to developing and implementing a long-term comprehensive plan to restore ecological health and improve water management for beneficial uses in the Bear Creek Watershed. The WA will focus on land use (including forest land, agriculture, and urban uses), hydrology, water quality, stream channel morphology, fisheries and aquatic habitat, sediment sources, transportation development, and recreation. When completed, the assessment will identify action options and contribute to ongoing implementation throughout the project area, provide direction to WSRCD, agencies, and stakeholders in developing a watershed management plan and support project implementation priorities for up to twenty years.

Bear Creek is identified in the Anadromous Fisheries Restoration Program (AFRP) for restoration plan action categories under fish screens and water acquisitions. A WA is important to developing a working relationship between the local community and the SWRCB/CALFED program. Educational opportunities will improve this understanding and be critical to developing clearly supported action options. Through the use of the WSRCD and the CALFED web sites, the WA will be displayed to expand the information exchange throughout the region and the state. Tools to supplement the WA and improve communication throughout the watershed include public meetings, quarterly newsletters to all property owners and interested residents, and articles and Public Service Announcements to local media.

The following are the goals and objectives of the Bear Creek Watershed Assessment:

- Documenting existing conditions within the watershed, by gathering existing data on the conditions of water, geology and soils, erosion, hydrology, vegetation, fisheries, wildlife, human uses and fire and fuels;
- Concluding, based on existing data, if watershed conditions may be limiting beneficial water uses and/or anadromous and resident fish populations;
- Providing information from which the newly formed Bear Creek CRMP Group can begin the preparation of a watershed management plan;
- Identifying areas where additional information is needed in order to develop a watershed plan; and
- Providing staff support to the watershed program and to the educational/outreach to landowners and other stakeholders;
- Beginning a community process through which watershed stewardship is developed, and the local capacity for improved watershed management increased;
- Promoting the goal of improving and increasing aquatic and terrestrial habitats and ecological functions by addressing several ecosystem elements, including natural sediment supply and restoration or riparian and riverine aquatic habitats.

CAPACITY

The Western Shasta Resource Conservation District (WSRCD) has seven local volunteer directors, who assume leadership positions in providing direction to their community's natural resource programs. The District has a staff of twelve who are currently implementing over 30 grants totaling \$5,018,593, of which several are multi-year grants. The annual budget is over \$1.2 million per year. Technical support is available from collaborators on this project, who will be invited to participate on a Technical Advisory Committee. This includes the Pit Indian Tribal Council, USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish & Game, California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection, California Department of Water Resources, Bear Creek CRMP Group, Shingletown Fire Safe Project, and the Shasta-Tehama Bioregional Council. The project will be a success as measured by the completion of the Final Watershed Assessment, including Implementation Plan and Checklist.

In April 2001, WSRCD entered into a Sponsor Agreement with the Shasta Cascade Operation District of the California Conservation Corps, and has since used the CCC in various watershed restoration projects. On this project, WSRCD, the consultant, and Rick Vela of the CCC will work together to identify what aspect of the project will be accomplished by the CCC.

WSRCD has completed other Watershed Assessments and Watershed Management Plans, which have proven to be a valuable resource for watershed information. These include the Lower Clear Creek Watershed Analysis (January 1996), Lower Clear Creek Watershed Management Plan (September 1998), Upper Clear Creek Watershed Analysis (April 1999), and the Cow Creek Watershed Assessment (November 2001).

SWRCB/RWQCB and CALFED PRIORITIES

This project supports the following:

SWRCB / RWQCB priorities: R5-1: Support the capacity to establish and implement locally directed watershed management programs, including watershed assessments.

PROP 13 priorities: This project the supports Prop 13 goals of protecting and enhancing riparian and wetland habitats, monitoring water quality conditions and assessing the environmental health of the watershed, using GIS to display and manage the environmental data describing the watershed, preventing watershed soil erosion and sedimentation of surface waters, support beneficial groundwater recharge capabilities, and otherwise reducing the discharge of pollutants to state waters from nonpoint sources.

CALFED priorities: This project addresses CALFED Primary Watershed Objectives(1.5.1) to: Facilitate and improve coordination, collaboration, and assistance among government agencies, other organizations, and local watershed groups; Develop watershed monitoring and assessment protocols; Support education and outreach; Implement a strategy that will ensure support and long term sustainability of local watershed activities; Define the relationship between watershed processes and the goal and objectives of CALFED. The assessment also supports the primary objectives of Ecosystem Quality and Water Quality, since the water quality goals include protection and restoration of surface waters by the minimization of pollutant loadings and negative impacts resulting from urbanization; minimization of soil erosion and sedimentation problems; control and management of runoff to reduce or prevent flooding; management of aquatic and riparian resources

for active and passive pollution control; education of watershed constituents. Watershed restoration in Shasta County is directly connected to the health and well-being of the Bay Delta. CALFED goals and priorities will be linked with local goals and priorities and the connections made strong by including CALFED as a partner in all work done by WSRCD. Relating the needs of the Bay Delta with local needs helps participants develop a clear understanding why the restoration work must be consistent with CALFED monitoring protocols to assure long-term success.

COMMUNITY/STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH AND INVOLVEMENT

At the request of several residents, an initial mailing to 1,543 landowners and agencies was sent out by WSRCD in October 2001 to bring the community together to discuss the formation of a CRMP Group. Over 60 people attended the first meeting. At the second community meeting it was clear the top priority for residents was water quality and water quantity. WSRCD organized a water rights workshop given by specialists from the State Department of Water Resources, held at Black Butte Elementary school gymnasium in Shingletown. At the third community meeting the residents agreed on the formation of the Bear Creek CRMP (Coordinated Resources Management Plan) Group. The group agreed on the need for a watershed assessment, therefore the concept paper for this grant application was submitted. At the last community meeting, representatives from the RWQCB described the process for developing a citizen water monitoring program, which citizens would like to participate in this summer. This will be the subject of the next CRMP meeting in June. In July the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service will make a presentation on anadromous fisheries in the watershed. Monthly meetings will continue, with notification postcards sent out to everyone who has attended any of the meetings to date. Monthly reports are also being sent to the Shingletown Ridge Rider Newspaper, which are usually published in their paper.

Although the costs to date have not been covered by a grant, the board and staff of WSRCD feel the importance of this watershed to the goals of CALFED and the SWRCB warrant the expense. WSRCD publishes a quarterly newsletter for the watersheds, which focuses on education, activities, and projects occurring within the District. The stakeholders in Bear Creek Watershed would benefit from being included in this publication.

In addition, future implementation of restoration opportunities is an integral step toward improving Chinook salmon and Steelhead populations in Bear Creek. Costs include bidding out the project and hiring an experienced consultant to prepare the watershed assessment, project management from WSRCD, support for meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee, education and outreach throughout the Bear Creek Watershed community, and publishing costs for the draft and final assessment reports. These costs were estimated using actual experience in completing assessments in Lower Clear Creek, Upper Clear Creek, and Cow Creek Watersheds. Although this project will not require continued funding, after the WA is completed, the CRMP, together with the RCD, will work to obtain funding for a watershed management plan and implement projects to improve the health and vitality of the watershed.

2 – PROPOSED WORK TO BE PERFORMED (Start with Task 4.)

Task 4. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

4.1 Formation of TAC

Task Products: 4.1 TAC membership list

Task 5. Education and Outreach

5.1 Public Meetings

Public meetings will be held: after the grant contract has been signed, to explain the project to the community; mid-way through the project to let the community know about the progress; after the draft watershed assessment has been issued in order to distribute the document and request suggestions or changes; presenting the final document when it is completed.

5.2 Disseminate information

Information about the various aspects of the watershed will be distributed at community meetings throughout the process.

5.3 Newsletters

Quarterly newsletters of a minimum of 2 pages each will be mailed quarterly to all residents in the watershed. It will be part of the WSRCD watershed newsletter, which also contains educational information in order to minimize printing and mailing costs.

5.4 Newspaper articles

Monthly press releases to the Shingletown Ridge Rider will keep residents informed about meetings and progress on the assessment.

Task Products: 5.1 Meeting sign in sheets; meeting minutes; 5.2 handouts; 5.3 newsletters; 5.4 newspaper articles.

Task 6. Watershed Assessment

6.1 Prepare a Watershed Assessment based on earlier information and existing information of watershed attributes, including:

- a. watershed history
- b. land use (including recreation)
- c. hydrology and water use
- d. water quality
- e. channel morphology and sediment transport
- f. fisheries and aquatic habitat
- g. fuels and fire conditions

6.2 For the watershed attributes described in 6.1, the assessment shall include an analysis of earlier and present conditions and conclusions by the Technical Advisory Committee.

Task Products: 6.1 Bear Creek Watershed Assessment; 6.2 conclusions by TAC

Task 7. Suggested Implementation Plan And Checklist

7.1 Suggested Implementation Plan

Prepare a master plan for suggested implementation of a water quality improvement program resulting from this project. Identify additional data needs and make recommendations for future watershed program activities (from above). Identify resources necessary for implementation. Estimate costs and include a list of possible funding sources. The suggested recommendations will include possible objectives to track effectiveness of any implementation, as well as an implementation cost estimate. The suggested recommendations will be included in this project's Draft and Final reports.

7.2 Implementation Checklist

Prepare an Implementation Checklist for annual post-project assessment by the State Water Board. The checklist will consist of no more than a one-or two-page form that summarizes the objectives listed in Task 6.1. The checklist form shall be submitted to the Contract Manager with the project Final Report.

Task Products: 7.1 Suggested Implementation Plan; 7.2 Implementation Checklist

Task 8. Draft and Final Project Reports

8.1 Draft Final Project Report

Prepare a draft final project report, which includes the results of the task work completed by this project. Include in the report all elements of Tasks 3-5, including subtasks under each of those sections. Submit this draft report to the Contract Manager, the TAC, and all other affected public and private agencies, and interested parties for review and comment. Prepare responses for all comments made on the draft report. The draft will also be available for review by interested parties at least at one public meeting.

8.2 Final Project Report

Prepare a final project report, which incorporates all relevant comments made on the draft report by the Contract Manager and others. Submit the final report to the Contract Manager for review and acceptance, and distribute the final report to members of the TAC and all public and private agencies and individuals with an interest in the project. As part of the final report, a Data Entry Form provided by the Contract Manager will be submitted to the Information Center for the Environment (ICE) at the University of California-Davis for posting on the Internet on their Natural Resource Project Inventory web site.

Task Products: 8.1 Draft Report; 8.2 Final Reports

3. TARGET COMPLETION DATES

Task	Deliverables	Due Dates
1.	Project Management and Administration	
1.1	Quarterly reports	10 th of every January, April, July and October
1.2	Subcontractor Documentation	9-30-03
1.3	Expenditure/Invoice Projections	Monthly
1.4	Project Survey Form	10-30-03
2.	CEQA/NEPA	
2.1	CEQA/NEPA Documentation	11-30-03
2.2	Permits (not applicable in this case)	Not applicable
3.	Quality Assurance Plan	12-31-03
4.	Technical Advisory Committee	
4.1	Formation of TAC	10-30-03
5.	Education/Outreach	
5.1	Public Meetings	1-31-04, 4-31-04, 7-31-04
5.2	Disseminate information	Monthly
5.3	Newsletters	Quarterly
5.4	Newspaper articles	Monthly press releases
6.	Watershed Assessment	
6.1	Prepare Watershed Assessment	4-30-04
6.2	TAC review of assessment	5-30-04
7.	Suggested Implementation Plan and Checklist	
7.1	Suggested Implementation Plan	7-31-04
7.2	Implementation Checklist	7-31-04
8.	Draft and Final Project Reports	
8.1	Draft Final Report	6-30-04
8.2	Final Report	8-31-04

PART C1 - BUDGET SUMMARY SHEET – TASK BUDGET BREAKDOWN (Parts C1 and C2 combined not to exceed 2 pages)

	Proposition 13 Funds	Other Project Funds	Total Budget
1. Task 1 – Project Administration	\$2,500	\$	\$2,500
2. Task 2 – CEQA/NEPA Documents and Permits	100		100
3. Task 3 – Quality Assurance Project Plan	2,000		2,000
4. Task 4 – Technical Advisory Committee	2,000		2,000
5. Task 5 – Education/Outreach	8,000		8,000
6. Task 6 – Watershed Assessment	94,340	5,000	99,340
7. Task 7 - Implementation	2,500		2,500
8. Task 8 -- Draft and Final Reports	11,000		11,000
General Overhead 15%	18,366		18,366
TOTAL BUDGET	140,806	5,000	145,806

PART C2 - BUDGET SUMMARY SHEET – LINE ITEM Budget (Parts C1 and C2 combined not to exceed 2 pages)

	Proposition 13 Funds	Other Project Funds	Total Budget
1. Personnel Services	<u>\$ 34,640</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$34,640</u>
2. Operating Expenses	<u>12,800</u>	<u></u>	<u>12,800</u>
3. Property Acquisitions			
a. Equipment	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
b. Furniture	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
c. Portable assets	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
d. Electronic data software/hardware	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
e. Processing equipment	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
f. Miscellaneous	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
4. Professional and Consultant Services	75,000	5,000	80,000
5. Contract Laboratory Services	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
6. Construction Expenses	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>
7. General Overhead	<u>18,366</u>	<u></u>	<u>18,366</u>
8. TOTAL BUDGET	<u>140,806</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>145,806</u>

9. Percent of Match Share in dollars = 22%

10. Describe the source and nature of the matching funds.

In Kind from members of the Technical Advisory Committee attending meetings, as well as members of the Bear Creek Watershed CRMP.

PART D – QUESTIONNAIRE (not to exceed 13 pages)

The application must follow the format provided in this RFP. The Project Questionnaire (Part D) must include the question number and the associated question. Do not include the explanatory text (shown in italics) provided with the questions. An electronic copy of the application without the explanatory text is available on the website at www.swrcb.ca.gov/prop13/index.html.

1. Identify, if applicable, the major sources of NPS pollution that will be addressed by the project (check all appropriate sources).

☒ Agriculture ☐ Forestry ☒ Urban (Construction, Roads, Septic Systems)
☐ Stormwater/Urban Runoff
☐ Marinas and Boating Activities ☐ Hydromodification
☐ Resource Extraction Other: _____

2. Is the proposed project identified in an existing watershed management plan, restoration action strategy, or equivalent document?

The Bear Creek Watershed is identified in the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program Plan. The step after completion of the Watershed Assessment will be a watershed management plan and restoration action strategies.

3. What other restoration or protection actions or projects have been taken previously to implement the document?

Members of the Bear Creek Watershed CRMP have volunteered to do water quality monitoring this summer in the watershed, with the assistance of the RWQCB.

4. Is this a next-phase of an ongoing project? Yes__ (if “yes,” describe) No_X__

5. Describe how the project will result in ongoing or widespread implementation throughout the project area, region, or state.

Members of the Bear Creek Watershed CRMP are very clear that water quality and quantity is of utmost importance in this watershed. Their drive and ambition will result in ongoing implementation in the watershed.

6. Describe related anticipated future work in the affected watershed.

Residents anticipate future work will be protection measures for water quality, restoration of riparian areas, installation of fish screens, and improvement of anadromous fisheries habitat.

7. Will the proposed project achieve measurable water quality improvements?

The watershed assessment in itself will not result in measurable water quality improvements.

8. Identify the NPS management measure(s) (see Section 6 of the ARD) that the proposed project will implement and describe how you will be able to track or account for the implementation of these measures.

Not applicable.

9. List the watershed group(s) of which the applicant is a member.

The WSRCD is a member of the Bear Creek Watershed CRMP, Lower Clear Creek CRMP, Upper Clear Creek Watershed Management Group, Cow Creek Watershed Management Group, and Shasta West CRMP.

10. Describe the level of local support for your project, including local government, tribal government, organized groups, landowners, agencies, and others working in the watershed. Also identify your relationship to other watershed or ecosystem projects and programs in your area.

Supporters include the Bear Creek Watershed CRMP, Shasta County Board of Supervisors, Redding Rancheria, California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection, California Department of Fish & Game, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Regional Water Quality Control Board, W. M. Beaty & Associates, Good News Rescue Mission, Shasta Land Trust, and Shasta College.

Relationship to other projects in the area: The WSRCD is involved in watershed groups and projects in the following watersheds: Lower Clear Creek, Upper Clear Creek, Shasta West (Middle, Rock, Salt, Olney and Canyon Creeks), Cow Creek, Battle Creek, Cottonwood Creek, and now Bear Creek. WSRCD currently has over 30 grants for project planning and implementation throughout these watersheds.

11. Indicate if this project is implementing a proposed or existing TMDL (see Section 19 of the ARD).

No.

12. Summarize actions that have been accomplished to date to address the problem(s) (e.g., past monitoring, planning, implementation phases).

Monthly meetings of the CRMP group continue, along with preparation for volunteers helping with water quality monitoring this summer.

13. Describe related activities that have been completed to provide the reviewers with additional background information to understand and review the proposed project. These activities may include monitoring, watershed planning, water quality assessment, technology testing, and implementation projects.

Shingletown is the largest community in the Bear Creek Watershed. Since the early 1990s, CDF has been implementing Community Clean Up Days, working with property owners to remove excess vegetation from their properties to protect the area from a devastating wildfire. This program has been very successful. WSRCD has received a grant from the Forest Service to complete a Strategic Fuels Reduction Plan for the greater Shingletown area this year. Members of the Bear Creek Watershed CRMP will participate in the Technical Advisory Committee for this project.

14. Have any previous Proposition 13 implementation grants or grants from other agencies and other funding sources (such as CALFED, CWA Section 319[h] or 205[j], Proposition 204) been awarded for work in this watershed? *List each project by title, the source of funds, and the year you received the grant(s).*

No.

15. Describe the financial/institutional capability or commitments that the applicant has to ensure that the project will be completed.

WSRCD has seven local volunteer directors, who assume leadership positions in providing direction to the district's natural resource programs. The District has a staff of twelve who are currently implementing over 30 grants totaling \$5,018,593, of which several are multi-year grants. The annual budget for WSRCD has exceeded one million dollars a year for the last three years. The budget for 2002-2003 is estimated at \$1.4 million. Each year the District has received clean audited financial statements with no findings.

16. Is the project ready to proceed?

Yes, immediately.

17. Describe how the project will demonstrate a capability of sustaining water quality benefits for a period of 20 years as required by Proposition 13 (CWC Section 79080(f)).

The watershed assessment will demonstrate the importance of sustaining water quality benefits in order to improve and maintain water quality far into the future.

18. If there is an NPDES permit required for this project area (check with your RWQCB), describe the relationship of the project to the permit.

Not applicable.

19. Indicate if the project will utilize the services of the California Conservation Corps, community conservation corps, or other local nonprofit entities employing underprivileged youths.

WSRCD will work with the consultant who completed the watershed assessment to see if there are opportunities for the CCC to participate in some way in this project. There might be possibilities for research work with agencies to locate data.

20. Will land, right of ways, or easements be purchased with Proposition 13 funds? Who will hold the title?

Not applicable.

21. Have adjacent landowners been notified of the project and the request for funding under this program as required under Proposition 13 (CWC 79080 (h)(2) or Page 5 of the RFP)?

Landowners in the watershed are receiving notification through the local newspaper, called the Shingletown Ridge Rider, and through the Bear Creek Watershed CRMP.

PART E - Map (8½ x 11)

PART F – Environmental Information Form

NEPA/CEQA

1. Will this project require compliance with CEQA, NEPA, or both? Yes _____ No X
2. If you checked “no” to question 1, please explain why compliance is not required for the actions in this proposal. This is a planning document.
3. If the project will require CEQA and/or NEPA compliance, identify the lead agency(ies).

CEQA Lead Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Agency

NEPA Lead Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Agency

4. Please check which type of document will be prepared.

	CEQA		NEPA
Categorical Exemption	<u>X</u>	Categorical Exclusion	<u>X</u>
Initial Study	_____	Environmental Assessment/FONSI	_____
Environmental Impact Report	_____	Environment Impact Statement	_____

Fish and Wildlife Service Manual at 516 DM 6 Appendix 1.4 Categorical Exclusions Section B Resources Management: (1) Research, inventory, and information collection activities directly related to the conservation of fish and wildlife resources.

5. If the CEQA/NEPA process is not complete, please describe the estimated timelines and cost for the process and the expected date of completion.
6. If the CEQA/NEPA document has been completed:

What is the name of the document? _____

Please attach a copy of the CEQA/NEPA document cover page to the application.

7. Environmental Permitting and Approvals

Please indicate what permits or other approvals may be required for the activities contained in your proposal and which have already been obtained. Please check all that apply.

LOCAL PERMITS AND APPROVALS	Needed?	Obtained?
Conditional use permit	No	
Variance	No	
Subdivision Map Act	No	
Grading permit	No	
General plan or Local Coastal Program amendment	No	
Specific plan approval	No	
Rezone	No	
Williamson Act Contract cancellation	No	
Local Coastal Development Permit	No	
Other	None	
STATE PERMITS AND APPROVALS	Needed?	Obtained?
Scientific collecting permit	No	
CESA compliance: 2081	No	
CESA compliance: NCCP	No	
1601/03	No	
CWA 401 certification	No	
Coastal development permit	No	
Reclamation Board approval	No	
Notification of DPC or BCDC	No	

APPLICATION FORM
Western Shasta Resource Conservation District
Application No.159

Other		
FEDERAL PERMITS AND APPROVALS	Needed?	Obtained?
ESA compliance Section 7 consultation	No	
ESA compliance Section 10 permit	No	
Rivers and Harbors Act	No	
CWA 404	No	
Other	None	
PERMISSION TO ACCESS PROPERTY		
Permission to access city, county or other local agency land. If “yes,” indicate the name of the agency: _____	No	
Permission to access State land. If “yes,” indicate the name of the agency: _____	No	
Permission to access federal land. If “yes,” indicate the name of the agency: _____	No	
Permission to access private land. If “yes,” indicate the name of the agency: _____	No	

PART G - LAND USE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do the actions in the proposal involve construction or physical changes in the land use?
Yes____ No__X__

If you answered “yes” to # 1, describe what actions will occur on the land involved in the proposal.

If you answered “no” to # 1, explain what type of actions are involved in the proposal (i.e., research only, planning only). Research and planning only.

2. How many acres of land will be subject to a land use change under the proposal? ____-0-____

3. What is the current land use of the area subject to a land use change under the proposal? What is the current zoning and general plan designation(s) for the property? Does the current land use involve agricultural production?

- a) Current land use _____N/A_____
b) Current zoning _____
c) Current general plan designation _____
d) Does current use involve agricultural production? Yes____ No____

4. Is the land subject to a land use change in the proposal currently under a Williamson Act contract?
Yes____ No____ Not applicable X

5. What is the proposed land use of the area subject to a land use change under the proposal?
Not applicable

6. Will the applicant acquire any land under the proposal, either in fee (purchase) or through a conservation easement?
Yes____ No__X__

- a) If you answered “yes” to 6, describe the number of acres that will be acquired and whether the acquisition will be of fee title or a conservation easement:
b) Total number of acres to be acquired under proposal _____
c) Number of acres to be acquired in fee _____
d) Number of acres to be subject to conservation easement _____

7. For all lands subject to a land use change under the proposal, describe what entity or organization will manage the property and provide operations and maintenance services.
Not applicable.

8. Will the applicant require access across public or private property that the applicant does not own to accomplish the activities in the proposal? Yes____ No__X__

9. For land acquisitions (fee title or easements), will existing water rights be acquired?

Yes _____ No ___X___

10. Does the applicant propose any modifications to the water right or change in the delivery of the water?

Yes _____ No ___X___

If “yes” to 10, please describe the modifications or changes.

PART H – SUPPORTING RELEVANT DOCUMENTS

LANDOWNER NOTIFICATION

Since this project covers the entire Bear Creek watershed, per the requirements the following is being done:

- A letter has been prepared for the 200 largest landowners about this grant proposal. A copy of the letter is Attachment #1. A list of landowners is on file by parcel number and the 200 largest will receive the letter
- A newspaper ad announcing the grant application has been prepared to run in the Shingletown Ridge Rider Newspaper for 3 weeks. This newspaper covers this watershed and is highly popular with the residents. A copy of the ad is Attachment #2.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT

Letters of Support **have been received** from the following:
Bear Creek Watershed CRMP Group

Letters of Support **have been requested** from the following (sample letter is Attachment #3):
Pit River Tribal Council
Shasta County Board of Supervisors
Shasta Tehama Bioregional Council
California Department of Fish & Game
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service
Good News Rescue Mission (large landowner)
W. M. Beaty & Associates (large landowner and land manager)

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Attachment 4: Cover from *Shingletown Wildfire Defense Plan*, 1995

Attachment 5: Front page of grant contract from the USDA Forest Service for a *Firesafe Plan for the Shingletown Community*, 2001.